

Easterling, Deborah

235287

**From:** Easterling, Deborah  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2012 1:29 PM  
**To:** 'Umcpaul@aol.com'  
**Subject:** RE: PSC Website Comments:

Dear Mr. Van Dine:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your email to our PSC Website Comments.

I am forwarding your email to our Clerk's Office for handling. Your email will become a part of Docket No. 2009-489-E and will be posted on our website under this Docket.

Please let me know if you should require any additional information.

Sincerely,

Deborah Easterling

**From:** [Umcpaul@aol.com](mailto:Umcpaul@aol.com) [<mailto:Umcpaul@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 15, 2012 12:40 PM  
**To:** Contact  
**Cc:** [umcpaul@aol.com](mailto:umcpaul@aol.com)  
**Subject:** PSC Website Comments:

To All Whom It May Concern:

I do appreciate the personal responses made to my January objection to the SCE+G billing procedure which gave a much higher bill for 800 fewer kw hours.

You were kind in your explanations of the trial formula you have allowed them to use; but I continue now to be upset by what this trial procedure is doing. And I **hereby request that you either (a) completely discontinue this billing formula or (b) allow it to be voluntarily chosen (like the older procedure for choosing an "averaged" consumption billing.**

My reasoning is this:

1. I never chose the previous formula of averaged billing, because I believe it is better to receive and base consumption plans, thermostat settings, etc. on ACTUAL uses and ACTUAL charges rather than averaging them. I believe this keeps the common consumer's awareness of utility costs much closer to heart than any averaging does. SO I never opted into THAT plan.
2. For similar reasons, but in an exaggerated manner, the formula to adjust bills according to average temperatures **even further divorces the customer's sensitivity to consumption and costs.** Moreover, it hides the kwh charges behind a big smokescreen making it impossible to judge whether the utility has been given extravagant charging privileges or not!

MAIL/DMS  
PSC

RECEIVED

3. As an example, my current billing for 2012 was for 2993 kwh used, which compared to 4881 kwh used in the same billing period for 2011. With nearly 1800 LESS kwh, the billing formula made our charges \$434.69 versus the larger \$502.45 for 2011. Although we had a smaller bill than before, there is no way that we as homeowners can reliably predict the effect of usage and billing with this kind of billing calculation thrown into the mix!  
**This is a bad procedure for ecologically concerned consumers.**

THEREFORE, I want to urge you at the earliest possible moment to **terminate the current billing formula -- or as an option allow customers to choose an accurate usage billing procedure.**

Thank you.

Paul E. Van Dine  
1020 Scotts Hill Road  
Chapin, SC 20936  
803-781-8621  
[umcpaul@aol.com](mailto:umcpaul@aol.com)